



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,866	06/29/2001	Sankar Sambasivan	5991	5367

22922 7590 09/11/2003

REINHART BOERNER VAN DEUREN S.C.
ATTN: LINDA GABRIEL, DOCKET COORDINATOR
1000 NORTH WATER STREET
SUITE 2100
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

COOKE, COLLEEN P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1725

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,866

Applicant(s)

SAMBASIVAN ET AL.

Examiner

Colleen P Cooke

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 9, 12-17, 19, 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 14, 18 and 20- 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5. 6) ☐ Other: ,

Art Unit: 1725

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-24 in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim as currently written contains a typographical error; it is assumed that the comma at the end of the claim ought to be a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 5, 7, 11, 14, 18, and 22 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. All of these claims include the limitation "wherein the...layer is selected from the group consisting of but not limited to" and as such language does not further require the subsequent list, the claim is not further limiting. For proper Markush group language, see MPEP § 2173.05(h).

Claims 10 and 21 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Each claims further limits the biaxially textured substrate of the parent claim to a single crystal metal substrate. It is unclear whether or not the

Art Unit: 1725

applicant is suggesting the invention includes a single crystal substrate that while being a single crystal also has a biaxial texture. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Both claims further limit a parent claim which already requires an electro-magnetic device layer by requiring an electro-magnetic device layer. It is not clear whether two such layers are intended. It is recommended that if two layers are being claimed, that claims 13 and 24 include language such as "further" or "additional" to clarify that in fact two electro-magnetic device layers are required.

Regarding claims 8, 9, 12, 14, 23, and 24, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 1725

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 8, 15-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goyal et al. (6447714)

The applied reference has two common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claims 1-5 and 15-17, Goyal et al. teaches preparing a biaxially textured articles of a Ni alloy which is processed to have a dominant cube oriented {100}<100> orientation texture and further epitaxially depositing a layer which may be a nitride (Column 4, lines 40-42, 50-54, 55-58). With specific reference to claims 5 and 18, since the nitride layer is not limited to the material listed, any nitride layer meets the limitation. With specific reference to claim 14, since either or both of x and y may be zero, any nitride meets this limitation as currently written.

Regarding claims 8 and 19, Goyal et al. teaches that the substrate and nitride layer are prepared as a surface suitable for further deposition of a superconducting layer (see Column 2, lines 24-44 generally and also claims 10 and 11).

Art Unit: 1725

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 7 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections(s) to the claims, as set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record does not teach or suggest a biaxially textured article having more than one epitaxial nitride layer OR an oxide buffer layer on an epitaxial nitride layer.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Colleen Cooke, whose telephone number is 703-305-1136. She can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:15-5:45pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, her supervisor, Thomas Dunn, can be reached at 703-308-3318. The official fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-6078. The unofficial fax number for this examiner is 703-746-3048.

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist, whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

 CPC 9/3/2003
TOM DUNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700